



2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-3213  
T 202.293.7060  
F 202.293.7860

www.sughrue.com

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 09 2006

FAX

Date February 9, 2006

To Examiner Victor s. Chang

Of PTO Group Art Unit 1771

Fax 571 273-8300

From Peter D. Olexy Registration No. 24,513

Subject Response to Interview Summary

Our Ref Q67950 Appln No 10/028,914

Conf No 2679 Inventors Yoshihide MURAKAMI, et al.

Pages 3 (including cover sheet)

Please call attention to problems with this transmission by return fax or telephone. Thank you.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US.

This fax filing includes:

1. This cover sheet
2. Statement of Substance of Interview

#### CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Sir:

I hereby certify that the above identified correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner Victor s. Chang at the Patent and Trademark Office on February 9, 2006 at 571-273-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Deangela D. Williams', followed by a horizontal line.  
Deangela D. Williams

**PATENT APPLICATION**  
**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q67950

Yoshihide MURAKAMI, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/028,914

Group Art Unit: 1771

Confirmation No.: 2679

Examiner: Victor s. Chang

Filed: December 28, 2001

For: SUBSTRATE FILM FOR ADHESIVE SHEET AND ADHESIVE SHEET USING THE  
SAME**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****FEB 09 2006**

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on  
January 17, 2006:

**REMARKS**

A telephone interview was conducted with the Examiner on January 17, 2006. The only issue discussed was whether removing the limitation of original claim 5 from the proposed amendment would result in the amendment being entered. The Examiner said that it appeared that if the subject of claim 5 were removed from claim 17 as amended no new issue would be presented and the claims would be in better condition for appeal.

**It is believed that no petition or fee is required.** However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to